



JAMES FITZGERALD. H. W. BOOKSTAVEN. C. H. TRUAX. MILES BRACH. G. P. ANDREWS. P. H. DUGRA.
L. A. GIEGERICH. DAVID LEVENTRITT. J. J. FRIEDMAN. A. R. LAWRENCE. FREDERICK SMYTH. H. R. BECKMAN.

JUSTICES OF THE SUPREME COURT, FIRST DEPARTMENT.

In their judicial robes, recently adopted as the costume for the bench.
(Copyright, 1899, by Rockwood, New-York.)

GOWNS HAVE A GOOD EFFECT.

THE RECENT INNOVATION BY SUPREME COURT JUSTICES BEARS FRUIT.

The judges and the members of the bar who were instrumental in bringing about the reform giving the justices of the Supreme Court the black silken robes of office which they now wear have been complimented for their wisdom.

It is less than one month since the justices began to wear their robes of office, but the people who visit the courtrooms as well as the justices have been convinced that the robe has brought about a decided change for the better. One of the justices, in speaking on the subject, said that hundreds of people who came to the Supreme Court rooms were unable to realize that their department should be different there from what it is in the places which they were accustomed to frequent. "Even lawyers," he said, "often failed to show the proper respect, and, having nothing in view but the desire to win a case, had to be held in check lest they overstepped the bounds of propriety. On these people the robe of office and the additional ceremony has had a highly beneficial effect, and I am sure that the robe has come to stay."

There was a strong feeling of opposition to the change on the part of people, who said that the custom was undemocratic, and that the adoption of the robe or gown would be the first step toward the introduction of the wig and other customs, which, in their opinion, would not be in harmony with a democratic form of government. "The Law Journal," in discussing the question, said:

There is great inconsistency in the survival of "Jacksonian" prejudice on this subject. If a judicial officer, after finishing his labors for the day, should appear on the golf links, clad in knickerbockers and other features of an "out-of-door" costume, the Jacksonians would be apt to be pleased. It would be said that the judge did not propose to carry any of the adventitious dignity of his office into private life. Out in the world he was a man, just like other men.

Why does not the converse of this sentiment make it equally praiseworthy in a judge to wear, when officiating, a costume identified with the courtroom by a stronger—historically almost a sacred—conventionality? Could there be anything more conducive to the observance by a judge of Lord Bacon's maxim, that when he sits in place he is another man?

The members of the Supreme Court of the United States have always worn the black silk robe, but the ugly and uncomfortable wig was never a part of the uniform. No State court adopted the gown at the outset, but a few years ago the members of the Court of Appeals of the State of New-York passed a resolution to wear gowns similar to those worn by the justices of the Supreme Court, and since then various bodies have followed the example. In no city of the State of New-York, however, have the

prejudices of the advocates of "simplicity" been overcome sufficiently to admit the black gown on the City Court bench. Even in Brooklyn the opposition has succeeded thus far in preventing the introduction of the robe. There is nothing gorgeous or picturesque about the new robes. They are made of heavy, lustreless silk, and are of the same pattern as the gown which was worn by John Calvin and known now among makers of ecclesiastical garments as Geneva gowns.

The advocates of the gown on the bench say that its adoption is simply doing honor to a costume which had its origin in Egypt, was perpetuated by the Jews and Romans, and survived in its original form through ages. The judge's gown was white in its early days, and changed many times in style and color until it became the present garment. The popularity of the black robe was established in the days when many of the judges were priests, and when, later on, laymen were selected as judges, they adopted a priestly robe to add dignity and importance to their office.

While there are many lawyers in New-York who still object to the gown there are also hundreds who believe that the moral effect of the garment would warrant its adoption by the judges of the lower courts.

THE ARCHDUKE AT THE POSTOFFICE.

From The London News.

An amusing incident, analogous to one recently reported in connection with the Duke of Norfolk, has occurred at Trieste. A peasant presented a parcel for dispatch to an official in the central postoffice of that town, and was roughly told that it could not be received, as it was improperly done up. The peasant inquired how it ought to be done up, and the official sharply replied that it was not his business to tell him. Here a gentleman intervened on the peasant's behalf, but was told by the official that if he had any fault to find he had better complain to the superintendent. The gentleman did so, but was told that postal officials could not be expected to teach the public, and that if he was not satisfied he had better complain to the director. The gentleman thereupon pulled out a card and said: "I have no time to go to the director. I request you to go to him yourself and tell him that I order him to come here instantly, and himself instruct this man how he must make up his parcel."

The superintendent looked at the card, and trembled when he read the name Archduke Louis Salvador. The director lost no time in coming. He stormed at the official, and all three nearly fell over one another in their zeal to show the peasant how to do up his parcel. A more carefully made-up package probably never passed through the Austrian postoffice. The incident, however, has excited a grave question. All the newspapers approve of the Archduke's intervention, but some pertinently ask whether he had any right to "order" the director to do anything. The champions of the Constitution are exercised, but, after all, the important thing is that the peasant got his parcel off.

CHAINS, BIG AND LITTLE.

HOW THEY ARE MADE AND TESTED—THE FIRST ENGLISH PATENT FOR THEIR MANUFACTURE.

Among the curiosities which were preserved in the old State Library at Albany none attracted more attention than the few links of the monster chain which did service in the days of the Revolution to prevent the progress of the British ships up the Hudson River. The great chain, with links more than two feet in length, was stretched across the river near West Point, and remnants of the unique blockading material are preserved in various parts of the country, several links being in the possession of Abram S. Hewitt.

Bombs, mines, fortifications and torpedoes have taken the place of the chain as a barrier against ships, but monster chains are still manufactured in large quantities, and the Jones & Laughlins Company is now making a chain the links of which are formed out of rolled steel three inches in diameter. Welding by electricity, winding the metal rod from which the links are made around a mandril, cutting the pieces by machinery and joining them by blows from powerful steam hammers, binding the links and testing the completed chains with hydraulic pressure are all modern processes in the chain-making industry, but the great chains used in the shipbuilding trade are made much as they were made many years ago. But, according to the statement of a manufacturer, the American now has the satisfaction of using the product of American shops. Formerly, and until about ten years ago, about 90 per cent of the chains used in the United States came from England, and now fully 95 per cent of the amount consumed is made in this country. Some concerns still carry English chains in stock in order to be able to supply English ships whose commanders usually refuse to buy any other than chains which have a British stamp.

The commercial article, as made in this country, ranges from three-sixteenths of an inch to one and three-quarter inches, and no chains are put on the market unless they have been tested. Thus a three-sixteenth-inch chain of five pounds average weight per foot is guaranteed to hold seven hundred pounds, and the better grades as high as nine hundred pounds. A one-inch chain which weighs about ten pounds to the foot will hold twenty-four thousand pounds, and a chain with links of one and three-quarter inches, weighing thirty-one pounds to the foot, is supposed to resist 71,600 pounds, and the best quality of the same size chain is marked "Proof 90,575 pounds."

In an interesting article on the subject of chains an English writer points to the fact that

notwithstanding the frequent mention of chains in the Bible the article is comparatively new. The same author says:

Some authorities give the Britons credit for originating the cable chain because Julius Caesar is recorded as having been unable to cut the cables of the Gauls' vessels, "as they were made of iron." This may have been a chain in the present acceptance of the term, but it is doubtful, because the first patent for chain-making was obtained in England in 1634 by a blacksmith named Philip White. The patent was for fourteen years, and in consideration of it White had to pay £5 in lawful money yearly "at the Exchequer, Westminster, at the Feast of the Blessed Virgin and Saint Michael the Archangel by even and equal process." His patent is described as follows: "A way for the wearing of ships with iron chaynes by finding out the true heating (pre)paring and tempering of Iron for that (purpose) and that he hath now attained to the true use of the said chaynes and that the same will be for the great saving of cordage and safety of shippers and will redound to the good of our Common Wealth."

SPECKLED CIGAR WRAPPERS.

HOW THE SPOTS ARE PRODUCED ON REAL SUMATRA LEAF.

Some of the tobacco imported from Sumatra for making the wrappers of cigars has a curiously speckled appearance. In the minds of certain buyers this marking is evidence that the cigar has a Sumatra wrapper. Such is not always the case, for the artful manufacturer has learned how to spot American tobacco artificially, and he occasionally does so in so clever a manner that the uninitiated customer never suspects the trick.

Sumatra is a Dutch possession, and the spotting of the tobacco raised in that island has been made the subject of investigation by Professor Boyerink, of the Amsterdam Academy of Sciences. This learned man presented to the Academy a few weeks ago a paper in which he set forth the results of his inquiry. He described a "living, fluid contagion," which he declares is the cause of the disease. This disorder, also known as the mosaic disease of tobacco leaves, may be inoculated into healthy plants by injecting into the stem, near a bud, sap pressed from infected plants. The active virus passes completely through the pores of very dense porcelain, and can even penetrate into agar by diffusion; therefore it cannot be a "contagium fixum" in the usual sense, but it must be fluid. Out of the tobacco plant it cannot be made to multiply; but in the dividing tissues of the leaf-rudiments and the meristems of the buds it multiplies freely and over a great extent. A very small drop of the porcelain filtrate can render all the leaves of the infected plant entirely covered with spots, and the sap of these leaves would be sufficient for the contagion of an unlimited number of healthy plants.